

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-46 are now pending in this application. The Office Action mailed December 16, 2004 rejected claims 1-46. Claims 1, 12, 30-32, 44, and 46 have been amended in this response. No claims are added, or deleted. No new matter has been added. For the reasons discussed in detail below, Applicants submits that the pending claims are patentable over the art of record and respectfully request that the Examiner pass this application to issue.

**Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-46 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,744,866 to Nolting et al. (hereinafter "Nolting"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. For example, amended Claim 1 recites a method for reporting communication records to at least one subscriber, the communication records of each subscriber including call transaction data corresponding to call transaction activity of the subscriber. The method includes, among other things, receiving a request for call transaction data from a subscriber, enabling the subscriber to select an electronic delivery mechanism for the formatted call transaction data, and electronically transmitting the formatted call transaction data to the subscriber using the subscriber selected electronic delivery mechanism. Thus, as claimed, the subscriber may select the electronic delivery mechanism for the call transaction data. See also Applicants' specification at page 16, lines 8-9 for support of these amendments.

Unlike the claimed invention, however, Nolting neither discloses nor suggests enabling the subscriber to select the electronic delivery mechanism. Instead, as described in Nolting, "the records may be transported to the [regional accounting office] by physical transport of data tapes, but preferably, each of the switches has an AMA Transmitter (AMAT) or the like coupled to an appropriate data link to allow electronic communications of the records..." See Nolting, Col. 14, lines 30-34. Nowhere does Nolting describe a mechanism whereby the subscriber selects the

electronic delivery mechanism, especially wherein the call transaction data is of the subscriber. Thus, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Nolting does not anticipate the claimed invention, nor make it obvious.

In addition, because amended independent Claims 12, 30-32, 44, and 46 include similar limitations as Claim 1, albeit different, they are also allowable for at least substantially the same reasons as independent Claim 1.

Moreover, Claim 32 further recites a method for reporting calls having associated call transaction data, the calls being between a subscriber and at least one second caller. The method includes, among other things, determining an approximate longitude and latitude of the second caller for each call using the call transaction data. However, nowhere in Nolting is it disclosed or suggested determining an approximate longitude and latitude of the second caller. Instead, Nolting merely provides an application user interface that may identify a study area which would provide an indication of the full extent of a geographic area that the analysis covers. See Nolting, Col. 21, 20-39. In addition, Nolting suggests that the three area code digits (NPA) and the NXX digits of an NXX-XXXX (seven-digit) telephone number can server as identifiers of end offices. See Nolting, Col. 8, lines 29-40. Neither a general reference to a study area, nor a reference to telephone numbers, suggests or discloses the limitations of Claim 32. Thus, for at least this reason Claim 32 is not anticipated by, nor made obvious by Nolting.

Furthermore, Claim 44 recites a method for reporting call records of calls involving a call party, wherein each of the calls has associated call transaction data by, among other things, generating a statistical report related to the call transaction data if the call transaction data is valid. Nowhere does Nolting suggest or disclose determining if the call transaction data is valid and then generating a statistical report related to the call transaction data. Thus, for at least reason, Claim 44 is not anticipated by, nor made obvious by Nolting.

In regard to Claims 2-11, 13-29, 33-43, and 45 which are dependent on amended independent Claims 1, 12, 32, and 44 respectively, they are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above for those independent claims.

## CONCLUSION

By the foregoing explanations, Applicants believe that this response has responded fully to all of the concerns expressed in the Office Action, and believes that it has placed each of the pending claims in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. Should any further aspects of the application remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Dated: April 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Jamie L. Wiegand  
 Jamie L. Wiegand  
 Registration No.: 52,361  
 DARBY & DARBY P.C.  
 P.O. Box 5257  
 New York, New York 10150-5257  
 (206) 262-8900  
 (212) 753-6237 (Fax)  
 Attorneys/Agents For Applicant